

## The Mexican Problem Statesmanship Not Intervention

HON. JOHN P. HIGGINS

REPRESENTATIVE FROM MASSACHUSETTS

*Extracts from an address delivered before the House of Representatives  
of the United States on June 10, 1935.*

**E**XACTLY two years ago today, on June 10, 1933, almost at this very hour, eight distinguished members of the United States Senate, headed by the leader of the Democratic majority, and with the whole-hearted support of the Roosevelt administration, rose in their places to denounce the persecution of the Jews in Germany. This was a courageous and an enlightened act. It marked the Administration as eager to bear aloft a liberal banner. Above all, it displayed the desire of statesmanship to follow numerous precedents in American history wherein the principle of religious liberty had been vindicated by executive officers of the United States Government, including many distinguished American Secretaries of State and Presidents of the United States.

On this anniversary, June 10, 1935, two years after the display of Senatorial indignation and protest, I rise in the Congress to make it evident to the peoples of the world that one voice at least in this body will not remain silent as long as a persecution, more violent than that in Germany, and more protracted in that it has extended over twenty years, continues to outrage the sense of humanity of the civilized world. I believe with Abraham Lincoln that the true liberal is concerned about the cause of liberty everywhere. Precious as are the liberties of the upright Jewish race in Germany, they are no more important than the rights of both Christians and Jews in Mexico. The principle is the same and one would expect it to be applied equally, no matter what group or what denomination happens to be under attack. No intervention was demanded in the Senate on June 10, 1933, and none is required now. But statesmanship was in demand then and it is in demand more than ever on June 10, 1935.

## BRITISH AND FRENCH DIPLOMACY ACTIVE

Furthermore, it must be recorded that American personal and property rights are being violated with impunity in Mexico. Although both the French and the British Governments have taken cognizance of the violations of French and British rights, the United States Department maintains an attitude of craven supineness in face of the repeated confiscations of American property in Mexico and despite the fact that thousands of American citizens are effectively deprived of the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. In order to prove that these assertions are established by indisputable proof, I offer for the record several sworn statements by American citizens of high integrity, who have suffered grievously in Mexico and been offered no redress. There was a time when an American citizen, like the proud citizen of the British Empire, could repeat the Roman challenge: *Civis Romanus Sum*, and find that it was a passport of security with honor any place in the world. Today, in the words of the Borah resolution, "American citizens of the Christian faiths have been outraged and reviled, their homes invaded, their civil rights abridged, and their lives placed in jeopardy," and when they seek satisfaction from the duly appointed representatives of the United States Government they are not even accorded a fair hearing.

I desire, today, to present to the members of the Congress, in a brief and impartial manner, a subject that might be properly titled, "Mexico's Challenge to American Ideals." Personally, I am grateful to have this opportunity, for I feel that I shall have contributed, in an humble manner, to the duty that is upon me, as upon every liberty-loving American, regardless of race or creed, to give public notice to the communistic policy of the present Mexican Government and the outrages that are being committed in Mexico against every ideal that Americans have cherished from the time of the formation of our Government to the present day.

This is the greatest issue of the day confronting the free men of America, for it constitutes a savage endeavor, made right at our doors, to crush out every vestige of human liberty, every scintilla of individual rights. The barbarism of the present Mexican administration is directed against men and women of all creeds who dare worship God, their Cre-

ator, in the manner their conscience dictates. Liberty of education is denied—teachers are compelled to either submit to governmental ukase or to resign. Internes and nurses who fail to take an active part in vicious anti-God demonstrations are subject to expulsion; in many cases they have actually been deprived of their positions and thus effectively prevented from completing the studies required for their chosen profession. Freedom of assembly is abolished—citizens have no right to meet and voice their views. Freedom of the press is prohibited—freedom of worship is prohibited—ministers of the Gospel, as in Nero's time, are cast out and churches denied the right to exist.

This sordid picture of the violation of human rights received my attention weeks before the present Congress convened. The tragedy, the outrages, the indignities that were being committed upon citizens of Mexico and the United States alike caused me to introduce the original resolution in this present Congress on this subject, House Concurrent Resolution No. 3, on January 8, 1935.

. . . . .

#### OUR DUTY AS AMERICANS

The American people find themselves confronted by a challenge of the fundamental principles and ideals that are the cornerstone of the structure of our Government. The source of that peril is in Mexico City. The climax of continued persecutions is near at hand, for no people can long suffer these outrages that have been imposed upon the people of Mexico by a godless and tyrannical minority in charge of State affairs in that country. The patience of the American people is as strained today as it was in 1925, when similar circumstances caused the then United States Secretary of State Kellogg to say, "The Government of Mexico is now on trial before the world."

#### NO DESIRE FOR INTERVENTION OR INTERFERENCE

Neither the American people nor the American Government has any desire to intervene by force or interfere in any way in the affairs of the Mexican Nation. We must, first and last, promote the cause of peace. An enlightened intercourse based on fuller knowledge and understanding of the facts must be encouraged. Thus guided, the right-thinking

and justice-loving men and women in Mexico, if allowed their inalienable rights of freedom to think and to vote, will rescue their country and its administration from the depths of religious persecution and of tyranny into which it has been misled.

#### THE ORIGINAL MONROE DOCTRINE

There is no doubt that our own country, when it uttered the Monroe Doctrine, assumed a measure of real responsibility to maintain the independence under a democratic government of the republics of this continent, to defend against tyranny and usurpation the peoples of those republics.

The Monroe Doctrine explicitly protested against the acquisition on this continent of any material foothold by any government inimical in tradition to the principles of our American Government. By that pronouncement the United States gave notice it would oppose even by physical force such acquisition of territory. If the acquisition of territory may be injurious and perhaps eventually fatal to the stability or well being of our own Government and our own institutions, may not the dissemination of principles, without any acquisition of territory, be equally injurious and fatal?

#### UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM—A NEED OF THE HOUR

There is no thought with us of the use of physical force or of any of those measures that lead to war. War and the thought of war are abhorrent to us. This should not blind us to the urgent necessity of both understanding the crisis and of being insistent in the presentation and defense of those truths that alone will save the crisis from catastrophe.

The danger today is no less grave than when seizure of physical territory on this continent was threatened by foreign powers. That threat spelt ultimately, as the United States saw, the death of liberty in the young republics to the south, and perhaps the death of liberty in our own land. The danger today is more subtle, more insidious. If the principles of liberty and true liberalism can be denied with impunity in Mexico, they may be so denied in other republics of Central or South America. They may be questioned in our own country, and if allowed to advance, may undermine our own understanding and our own enjoyment of true

liberty. Whatever minor problem the Mexican situation presents, this is the major problem—this is the problem—that challenges every right-thinking American and on which America must both speak and act for its own defense.

The republics of America are not only at the threshold of a period of rapid population growth and industrial development; they are equally with the rest of the world to feel the influence of the new political and social doctrines.

The problem which confronts our country today, in common with its neighbors of America, is: Shall we continue to maintain the high standards of justice, those eternal principles of human rights, upon which our system is founded and which are the lifeblood of our nation, or shall we stand idly by while systems develop which deny and denounce those principles? Are we to be as zealous today in safeguarding our precious political heritage as were our forefathers one hundred years ago, not guarding in rigid, fossil sameness, but conserving the foundations upon which it is erected, permitting it to grow and develop and become adjusted to the changing conditions of human life?

#### MEXICAN LIBERALISM, PAST AND PRESENT

In Mexico today, we are witnesses of widespread, radical social changes. The Mexican nation has survived almost twenty years of travail by which that nation has seen her moral and her physical strength sapped and wasted until she lies prostrate—helpless in the hands of her assailants.

Noble indeed was the cry of 1911. We fight not for the overthrow of one tyrant to set another on his throne. Alas, for the liberalism of those days, which demanded for man the greatest amount of individual freedom and liberty, and for the township and province the greatest amount of political autonomy consistent with national existence.

A new tyrant has indeed set himself up in Mexico—the tyrant of secularism, who defies God—denounces religion as man's worst enemy—and tramples under foot the rights with which man enters the world and of which he may not justly be deprived.

#### KNOWLEDGE WILL PRODUCE SYMPATHY FOR THE OPPRESSED

Loyalty to our own destiny demands that we defend our institutions as we did not hesitate to do of old; that we

stay the hand which would set up on our continent a system and a law subversive of that which we have inherited. Our sympathy must go out to the suffering and the lowly of Mexico whose rights are being trampled upon.

Popular sovereignty is not functioning in Mexico. It is not functioning, not because the people are unworthy or incapable but because its place has been usurped.

It behooves us to know conditions in our sister Republic with a full and honest knowledge. It behooves us to extend the helping hand of moral and material support to those who would devote themselves to the upbuilding on our southern border of a nation that at least recognizes as does our own those principles of the fundamental rights of man which are not merely national but international, which are the cornerstone of that common union of an equal humanity for which we labor. It is our bounden duty to defend these against the teachers of new, tyrannical doctrines, the preachers of strange communistic beliefs, to the end that, functioning freely, the people of Mexico may rescue their nation from the morass into which she is being led.

#### AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY

The impression is widespread among those who have knowledge of the recent history of Mexico that our Government bears the blame for what is happening in Mexico to-day. One cannot approach this subject on the theory that it is not within our province as a "good neighbor" to comment on the internal affairs of Mexico, for a review of our international relations with Mexico, documents and other papers of which there are a number on record with the State Department, will reveal we have disregarded the "good neighbor" theory and placed our relations with Mexico on an international-policy basis. Permit me to prove, if you will, by quoting from a carefully documented article appearing in the periodical *America*, published in New York City, August 21, 1926, to prove that the American Government is more responsible than any other government, group, class, agency, or individual in perpetuating the rule of these tyrants from the régime of Carranza to the present day, whose aim has been to sovietize Mexico.

*(Here follows the text of the article by Anthony J. Beck in AMERICA for August 21, 1926.)*

#### THE RESULT OF AMERICAN RECOGNITION OF CARRANZA

Property rights, more specifically the rights of the privileged Americans who had oil interests in Mexico, not human rights of life, liberty, and happiness, prompted Woodrow Wilson to recognize the government of the rebel Carranza, although at that time Mexico was abandoned to the savage passions of the revolutionary hordes who swarmed in from the mountains and valleys. Schools, colleges, and libraries, with their priceless manuscripts, were confiscated and destroyed. Ministers of the gospel, other clerics, and nuns were being murdered and ravished when Woodrow Wilson recognized the Carranza government in October, 1915. The conditions of Mexico as a result of the orgy of insurrection were described in pathetic terms by eyewitnesses to a committee of the United States Senate, which was appointed to report on conditions in Mexico by the Sixty-sixth Congress.

Therein is given a full and detailed description of how through the ruthlessness of Carranza the people of a great Republic were ravished, their culture wiped out, their property destroyed, and their very existence as a civilized nation placed in jeopardy. Have I not proven to your satisfaction that the régime of Carranza as President, and succeeded without interruption by Obregon, Calles, Cardenas, and Rodriguez and others, all of whom are members of the National Revolutionary Party, was only made possible by the policy adopted by the American Government? America has kept these brigands in power for twenty years.

#### THE CONSTITUTION OF 1917

Encouraged by the recognition which the Government of the United States extended to him in October, 1915, and by the success of his army under the red flag, Carranza convoked an election of Congress on September 14, 1916, to be known as the "Congress of Queretaro." In this proclamation, Carranza naively remarks that his opponents have objected to his decrees and that, should he proceed to set up a government with no more formality than had been observed in issuing the decrees, his enemies would at once bring

against it the charge that it did not have the sanction of the popular will, "which is sovereign." This proclamation is a colossal hypocrisy, and it is perfectly evident that in issuing it Carranza took infinite pains to make impossible the very thing which he pretended to favor, namely, a free and full expression of the will of the people of Mexico of its sentiments.

#### THE CONSTITUTION NEVER RATIFIED BY THE PEOPLE

Not only were the great majority of voters not permitted to vote, but, not trusting even his own followers, Carranza, in the law under which this election was held, prescribed that no candidate could be elected who was unable to prove that he had given material support to the Carranza revolution.

It cannot therefore in any sense be said that the constitution thus enacted is a supreme law freely adopted and approved by the people of Mexico. It was imposed upon the people by a chosen band of revolutionists, who did not have, by any means, control, even in a military way, of the Republic, and who had refused to fight under the national flag of Mexico but only under their own red banner.

This constitution has never been submitted to any form of ratification by the people of Mexico. Such is the law to which Calles and his defenders appeal when they claim they cannot accede to the demands of our State Department for justice to American citizens.

#### UNAUTHORIZED CHANGES IN CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of 1917 is the instrumentality under which Mexico is governed today. Up to the time of the adoption of this Constitution Mexico was governed from 1857 by the Juarez Constitution. The thought of the times can be exemplified by a comparison of these two instruments.

Article 1 (1917) reads:

Every person in the United States of Mexico shall enjoy the guaranties granted by this Constitution.

No mention of God or the inalienable rights of man. But how different from the earlier Mexican Constitution—that of 1857—which in the preamble and Article 1 reads as follows:



In the name of God and by the authority of the Mexican people. The Mexican people recognize that the rights of man are the basis and the object of social institutions.

The very existence of the 1857 Constitution was predicated on the fact that if God and the people approve it will be our Constitution, while the 1917 Constitution made no mention of either, it being signed on January 31, 1917, and promulgated without approval of the people five days later, on February 5, 1917. Carranza and his Congress were not content with the ordinary separation of Church and State set forth in the Constitution of 1857, but ruled that it must be more complete, and that the Church must be denied her right to life and liberty. To compare a document like the Constitution of 1917 with our American Constitution, embracing as it does the belief that men have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, would be a sacrilege and a mockery.

"Our war is a war on God" blasphemously proclaimed the leaders of the national revolutionary party in a debate on Socialist education, and thus at last those who control the Government in Mexico cast aside the cloak under which they so long have tried to hide the ugliness of the régime they impose on the Mexican people.

. . . . .

#### ATHEISTIC EDUCATION PRAISED BY DANIELS AS "PROGRESS"

A review of the following oath administered to school teachers in Mexico by the direction of the federal education merely confirms the relentlessness of the Government in its attempt to drive God from the school as well as the home:

In the presence of the board of federal education, I, ———, declare that I unconditionally accept the program of the socialistic school and that I will make it known and defend it.

I declare that I am an atheist, irreconcilable enemy of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, and I will endeavor to destroy it, detaching the conscience from any religious worship, and I am disposed to fight against the clergy anywhere and whenever it will be necessary.

I declare my readiness to take a main part in the campaign of defanaticization, to attack the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion wherever it may appear.

And I will not permit any kind of religious practices at my own home nor the presence of religious pictures.

I will not permit any of my relatives living under my roof to attend any religious ceremony.

The Mexican Government will not receive the support of men nor of nations that love justice if she persists in denying the fundamental right of the parent to care for the religious education of his child; if it drives God out, it merely confirms the relentlessness of the Government in its attempt to drive God from the school as well as the home.

. . . . .

#### A RECENT INTERVENTION BY DANIELS

Now, for the sake of the *Record* I add a quotation from the radio address delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, American Ambassador to Mexico. Sunday, April 7th, 5 p. m., inviting the Rotarians to visit Mexico.

The Mexicans—

declares Daniels—

are going forward in education. . . .

Does Mr. Daniels really believe that a solemn renunciation of God and religion on the part of public-school teachers represents progress in education? Does Mr. Cordell B. Hull support our Ambassador in his position? Does the President of the United States condone this dangerous flattery of an educational system that not only strives to exclude God but leads an attack on all religions? Do Messrs. Daniels, Hull, and Roosevelt contend that a denial of the parents' right to educate children is "to go forward in education"? Has Mr. Roosevelt forgotten that the first President of the United States, Gen. George Washington, in his Farewell Address praised religion and morality as the firm foundation of good government? Do not Messrs. Daniels, Hull, and Roosevelt know that in the case of *Pierce against the Sisters*, as well as in the case of *Meyer against Nebraska*, the highest tribunal in this land, the Supreme Court of the United States, by an overwhelming majority repudiated the unethical, un-American doctrine that the child is the property

of the State? To be sure, Mr. Daniels, with amazing effrontery, is permitted to criticize the United States Constitution as a relic of the ox-cart days. But that Constitution will stand long after Mr. Daniels has ceased to misrepresent us in Latin America. Thank God for the Supreme Court and the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution! Millions of my fellow citizens will join me in the confident belief that the Court and the Constitution will outlast the rhetoric of Messrs. Daniels, Hull, and Roosevelt.

. . . . .

The Mexican Government will not receive the support of men or of nations that love justice if she persists in denying the fundamental right of the parent to care for the religious education of his child; if it drives God out of all schools; if it makes of public education a political and governmental tyranny.

Our American Government stands upon two principles. The first is respect for and defense of the inalienable rights of the human individual, which majority rule may never violate, but must always support. One of those rights is the right of conscience, or religious liberty.

#### THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON EDUCATION

The second principle is like unto this first—freedom of spiritual, moral, and intellectual development, which, in a word, is freedom of education.

The decisive words on this subject were spoken by the Supreme Court of the United States (*Pierce v. The Society of Sisters*, 268 U. S. Repts., p. 535), Justice McReynolds—

The fundamental theory of liberty, upon which all governments in this Union repose, excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.

We believe that of this individual freedom is born responsibility; and, in our common corporate expression of it and its consequences, America has made and is to continue her life for the general welfare of all her citizens.

To know that the Government of Mexico is absolutely denying these principles today and advocating a political doctrine with which no American can agree, it is sufficient to read the present constitution of that country.

#### MEXICAN CONSTITUTION VIOLATES HUMAN RIGHTS

That constitution prohibits a minister of religion from teaching in any primary school, whether the school be public or private. Article 3 reads:

No religious corporation nor minister of any religious creed shall establish or direct schools of primary instruction.

Any school erected for the teaching of religion shall *ipso facto* become the property of the Federal Government, and in all matters, curriculum, teachers, and so forth, shall be under the direction of said Federal Government (cfr. art. 130).

No minister of religion nor a religious corporation is allowed to initiate or maintain any institution for scientific research (art. 130).

How shall we reconcile these facts with the first clause of article 3 of the constitution, which, copying the law of 1857, declares that education in Mexico shall be free?

#### FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL IS ABRIDGED

The insurgent band at Queretaro, having no hope of being able to mold these communities of devoted men and women to their materialistic program, decided upon the destruction of all religious orders.

Article 5 of the constitution provides:

The States shall not permit any contract, covenant, or agreement to be carried out having for its object the abridgement, loss, or irrevocable sacrifice of the liberties of man, whether by reason of labor, education, or religious vows. The law, therefore, does not permit the establishment of monastic orders, of whatever denomination or for whatever purpose contemplated.

Young men and women desiring to enter even the secular ministry of religion are, under this provision, to do so at the risk of having incurred an irremovable impediment against their entering any other field of learning should they dis-

cover any incompatibility in the ministry to which they sought to devote themselves.

Under no conditions shall studies carried on in institutions devoted to the professional training of ministers of religious creeds be given credit or granted any other dispensation of privilege which shall have for its purpose the accrediting of the said studies in official institutions. Any authority violating this provision shall be punished criminally, and all such dispensation of privilege be null and void, and shall invalidate wholly and entirely the professional degree toward the obtaining of which the infraction of this provision may in any way have contributed.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IS SUPPRESSED

Not only is the Church prohibited from engaging in any organized work of education—not only the ministers of religion and the Church—but laymen may not even engage in the open discussion in the press of topics of every day interest. The same article 130 provides:

No periodical publication which either by reason of its program, its title, or merely by its general tendencies, is of a religious character, shall comment upon any political affairs of the nation, nor publish any information regarding the acts of the authorities of the country or of private individuals, insofar as the latter have to do with public affairs.

Thus, the framers of the 1917 constitution sought to drive the Church from a field of social action in which the Church has rendered services of incalculable value to human society in all ages since her foundation and under all flags where she has been organized.

#### THE LAW ITSELF IS PERSECUTION

The constitution provides that only such ministers shall officiate as have been so designated by the legislature of the particular State, and no foreign-born may minister. Article 130 reads:

The State legislatures shall have the exclusive power of determining the maximum number of ministers of religious creeds, according to the needs of each locality. Only a Mexican by birth may be a minister of any religious creed in Mexico.

To know these provisions of the present Mexican Constitution is to know that they are absolutely irreconcilable

with justice and the rights of man. They tell plainly a warfare against religion—a deliberate endeavor to destroy its growth; to pull out its roots. We cannot accept it. Our whole national life has been a protest against such iniquity. It is abhorrent to every human instinct of fair play.

. . . . .

*(Representative Higgins thereafter adduces documents issued by the National Conference of Jews and Christians, Robert Hammond Murray, the atheistic Government of Mexico, Archbishop Ruiz, Pope Pius XI, Calles, Ambassador Daniels, President Roosevelt, Mexican Professors and Students, the Bishops of the United States, etc., and records the affidavits of various persons in regard to conditions in Mexico and the policy of the United States in regard to Mexico. He proves conclusively, also from documentary evidence, that Mexican officials interfere in the United States. He instances precedents of the United States Government "interposing its good offices," but without intervention in Mexican affairs that concerned the citizens of the United States. After quoting from the United States Senators who protested their disapproval of the Hitler policy toward the Jews of Germany, he draws the parallel in regard to the religious persecution in Mexico.)*

#### AMERICANS DEMAND STATESMANSHIP AND DIPLOMACY

I have tried in the time allotted to me to present to my colleagues a case based upon facts of the savage endeavor that is being made right at our doors in this the twentieth century to crush out every vestige of human liberty, every scintilla of individual rights. It is the greatest issue of our day; a militant, organized attack on the God of all religions. It makes no difference what religion you possess or what walk of life you follow, the sabotage of human rights in Mexico should produce a reaction of horror in every decent American who knows of them.

The wave of Communism that during the past seven years has brought disaster and chaos and a succession of bloody massacres in the Provinces of China is now firmly entrenched in our Western Hemisphere, attempting to take complete possession of Mexico, standing as a menace at the threshold of America. History relates that when Carthage, the hereditary enemy of Rome, lifted her head in pride, Cato in the Roman Senate never ceased to cry, "*Carthago delenda est*—Carthage must be destroyed." His persistent demands bore fruit and Carthage was destroyed. We Americans continue to regard the approach of Communism with indiffer-

ence, as though the United States of America was too secure in her prosperity and supremacy among the other nations to ever fall a victim to Communism.

#### PRESIDENTIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The duty is plainly upon the President of the United States to speak his disapproval of the barbarous policies of the present Mexican Government and thus protect the lives and property of Americans and reiterate the doctrine of human rights that has been so eloquently expressed by many of his predecessors in office under similar circumstances to those that exist in Mexico today. There are critical moments in the slow, upward progress of civilization and in the history of the defense of human rights when "silence is not neutrality, but consent." I for one believe that, in the words of Lincoln, "the true liberal is concerned about the cause of liberty everywhere." And he who regards with equanimity the spectacle of his good neighbor in slavery is soon apt to find that chains are being forged in order to form a prison house for his own life, liberty, and happiness. I repeat that in the present instance "silence is not neutrality, but consent."

## The Truth About Mexico

HON. JOHN J. BOYLAN

REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK

*Extracts from an address delivered before the House of Representatives of the United States on June 21, 1935.*

MY attention has been drawn to an address delivered in New York at the invitation of Station WOR on their forum hour, May 5, 1935, by Mr. Eduardo Villaseñor, Mexican consul general, stationed in New York City. Since the Mexican Government dares to submit its case to the world and more specifically to the judgment of the American people, I feel obliged to refute the numerous falsehoods and misrepresentations which abounded in the discourse of Mr. Villaseñor.

In the first paragraph of his address the Mexican Consul General pretends that there is going on a campaign carried out against Mexico "by the Catholic hierarchy." This is a cowardly lie. It is well known that the organ of the Episcopal Church, *The Living Church* in this country, has more than once condemned the Mexican attitude on religion as a "major scandal in world affairs." Numerous enlightened, intelligent, and fair-minded Protestant prelates and laymen, Jewish rabbis, and leaders of public opinion have in unmistakable terms, and on occasions too numerous to mention, condemned the assault on God which is now being carried on in the Republic of Mexico.

Only a few weeks ago there was published in the city of New York a carefully documented volume entitled, "Chaos in Mexico," by Dr. Charles S. McFarland, secretary general emeritus of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Dr. McFarland made a careful and extensive visit to Mexico precisely to find out whether religion as such and not merely the Catholic Church was the subject of persecution. He returned a categorical answer on that subject, stating that the assault was one upon the idea of God and religion as such.

The *American Hebrew* has likewise protested against the persecution of all religions in Mexico. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians have likewise protested against this persecution. The National Conference of Jews and Christians has gone on record in most emphatic terms condemning the official Mexican persecution of religion. Jewish synagogues have been closed in Mexico. Mormon temples in the State of Chihuahua have been closed for the purpose of public worship. Even the schools conducted by British, French, and American citizens have been given the choice of accepting socialistic and gross forms of sexual education or complete elimination from the Mexican scene.

In the second paragraph of his speech, Mr. Villaseñor makes mention of "historical facts." I challenge him to deny the following historical facts: First, that the first hospital on this continent was the Hospital of Jesus in Mexico City; that the first university was founded under religious auspices in Mexico; that the first medical school was erected; and that the first printing press and the first book available on the North American Continent were brought



from Spain to Mexico by the first Bishop of Mexico City. The first book printed in North America came from the press of Bishop Zummraya. Mr. Villaseñor is the one who has forgotten history and is now making an attempt to distort the facts.

In the third paragraph of his speech Mr. Villaseñor condemns "sectarian sheets" in the United States for the publicity they have given to the extremes of religious persecution practiced in Mexico. Does he consider the *New York Times* a sectarian sheet? This newspaper printed an authentic report of the murder and assault on innocent men, women, and children at Guadalajara, Mexico. Does he consider S. L. A. Marshall, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, a "sectarian" when he says that in Mexico religious freedom has ceased to exist? And, finally, does he regard Robert Hammond Murray, who has written a splendid series of articles in *Today* and has published several letters in the *New York Times*, as a partisan and "sectarian" when he describes the facts of the present persecution in Mexico? None of these gentlemen can be charged with having any tinge of Catholic bias.

In the fourth paragraph of his speech Mr. Villaseñor criticizes books which have been published on this subject. The two books that have been referred to most frequently and favorably by the American press are: First, "Chaos in Mexico," by Dr. Charles S. McFarland; and, second, "Blood-Drenched Altars," by Bishop Kelley, of Oklahoma. As far as I am aware, not a single fact related in either of the two books has ever been effectively refuted by the Mexican Government.

Mr. Villaseñor does give a summary in brief of the amendment to Article 3 of the constitution of Mexico. This statement proves the contradiction to the principles of the natural law upon which the Constitution of the United States was predicated. It reads as follows:

1. Education shall be provided by the State.
2. Education shall be socialistic, divorced from all religious doctrines, and shall combat fanaticism and prejudice in such a way that school activities will create in Mexican youth a rational concept of the world and social life.
3. Only Federal, State, and municipal authorities shall have the right to give primary-, secondary-, or normal-school education.

4. Religious groups of ministers will be forbidden to interfere directly with primary-, secondary-, or normal-school education.

5. The formulation of educational programs shall be entirely under the State control.

6. No private school may function without State authority.

7. Primary education for children shall be compulsory and provided free by the State.

What Mr. Villaseñor fails to note is that this series of laws in itself is a persecution and a species of tyranny.

Mr. Villaseñor asks the following question: "Does non-religious teaching necessarily imply antireligious education?" To that I answer by revealing the blasphemous version of the "Our Father," that prayer dear to the heart of all who believe in God in His Heaven, which was published in *Christo Rey*, an official publication of the Government, while Garrido Canabal was Minister of Agriculture.

"Our Father, who art not in heaven, for there is neither a God nor any question of sanctity to say nothing of saints—only imbeciles believe in them—I mock and blaspheme You. May Your kingdom never arrive, pure and upright, and let Your will accomplish itself in burning statues and hanging ministers of religion and in destroying all churches both in the country and in the city."

Apparently Mr. Villaseñor is unaware of the fact that the United States Supreme Court has declared that the parent primarily has the right of education of the child and that "the child," in this historic decision, is "not a mere creature of the State."

It is a lie that Mexico has had to conquer Catholic resistance at every move toward social progress. Every attack upon the Catholic Church in Mexico during the past two hundred years has coincided with a lowering of the standard of living and abridgement of liberty, and has retarded social progress. To give only one example, there was established over one hundred years ago one of the most beautiful, most splendidly equipped and charitably inspired orphanage, by Bishop Cabañas in Guadalajara, Mexico. This saintly prelate begged alms to erect this orphanage for the abandoned boys and girls of Mexico, traveling on foot from the jungles of Yucatan to the arid, desertlike plain of Sonora. Now one hundred years after his death, in an institution built by Christian charity and inspired, if any institution in the

world was ever inspired, by the love of God, it is not permitted to mention religion or to speak of goodness, conscience, or divine love. If you visit the orphanage of Padre Cabañas today you will find not a single emblem of religion; you will be greeted by no hymn in praise of the Deity. No words of the supernatural life are spoken within the precincts of that charitable institution originally consecrated to the love of God. On the contrary, children are paraded before you singing with pathetic accent the ribald songs of the streets.

Toward the end of his address Mr. Eduardo Villaseñor has the audacity to claim that not a single one of the 50,000 federal employees of the present administration have been discharged on account of religion. He disregards entirely the authentic report carried by the Associated Press and other national press services last October—which gave the names and the number of those internes and nurses who had been discharged from their positions in hospitals because of their refusal to take part in an anti-God demonstration of the Mexican Government.

However, in order to give the lie direct to this charge and to put on record something which twenty years ago would have horrified the people of the world, I am going to give the names of two eminent world-renowned artists and scholars who, simply because they failed to march in the atheistic demonstration of the Mexican Government, were discharged from their positions. I refer to Don Frederigo Mariscal, chief architect of the National Palace of Fine Arts in Mexico City, celebrated in artistic circles throughout the world for his genius and honored universally for his noble character. The second was a Protestant, Dr. Alonzo Caso, the most gifted archeologist in the employ of the Federal Government.

On the last page of his address the Mexican consul general states that the Mexican Embassy in Washington gave a statement to the press on February 28, 1935, denying that the Government of Mexico has ever authorized any Federal board of education or any single one of its teachers throughout the Republic to compel anybody, either teacher or pupil, to sign the pledge which appeared in American newspapers. Once more I refer to the book by Dr. Charles S. McFarland. His researches verified the oath. I also refer you to the text of the oath administered in the State of Michoacan to

teachers throughout the State *and countersigned by the federal inspector of education:*

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_

Civil condition \_\_\_\_\_

Normal school graduate or not \_\_\_\_\_

Name of institution \_\_\_\_\_

I. Declaration of adherence to article 3 of the constitution (socialistic education).

II. Declaration of purpose to inculcate doctrines of socialism of the Republic.

III. I declare my purpose to teach without reservation the postulates and principles as they are proposed by the National Government.

IV. I declare absolutely that I do not profess either the Catholic faith or any other religion.

V. I declare absolutely that I will combat by all possible means the efforts of the Catholic clergy and all other ministers of religion.

VI. I declare absolutely that I will not practice any act of religion, interior or exterior, be it of the Catholic Church or any other religion.

Place and date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of teacher)

The inspector of federal education who affixes his name must ascertain that the above signature is the one employed by the teacher in all his official business.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of inspector)

There are photostatic copies of these oaths in Washington and in Baltimore showing the names the teachers have signed and also the name the inspector of education has signed.

In other words, Mr. Villaseñor will have to furnish us with something better than mere denials of these facts that have been vouched for by the highest authority and reported by eyewitnesses of these events which clearly establish the opposition of the Mexican Government to religious liberty and the love of God.